[19th November 1930

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"The answer given is complete."

Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—"May I know if the hon. the Law Member will be pleased to have the chivalry to classify all the 'C' class lady prisoners under class 'B'?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I am afraid I have no option whatever to be chivalrous in a matter like this. I wish I could."

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS—cont.

Deputy Collectors

Appointment of Mr. Tamzuddin as the Revenue Divisional Officer of Tiruvannamalai.

*41 Q.—Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Revenue Divisional Officer, Tiruvannamalai division, is a native and pattadar of Adayur village in Tiruvannamalai taluk;

(b) whether there is a rule that persons owning property in a division should not be appointed executive officers of the same division; and

(c) what were the exceptional circumstances necessitating the appointment of Mr. Tamzuddin as the Revenue Divisional Officer of Tiruvannamalai?

A.—(a) The Government have no information whether or not Khan Bahadur Muhammad Tamzuddin Quadiri Sahib, Revenue Divisional Officer, Tiruvannamalai division, North Arcot district, is a native of Adayur village. So far as they are aware, he does not own land in that village or in that district.

(b) There is no such rule. The attention of the hon. Member, however, is invited to Local ruling (6) under Rule 11 and local ruling 8 (b) under Rule 10 of the Government Servants' Conduct Rules, a copy of which is in the Council Library.

(c) There were no exceptional circumstances.

General

Alleged orders regarding wearing of khaddar, caps or dress.

42 Q.—Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state whether the Government will be pleased to explain why the wearing of khaddar caps and dress by Government servants or private individuals was prohibited and why such people were illtreated and insulted?

A.—No such prohibition has been made by the Government. On 20th June 1930 the District Magistrate of Guntur in the interests of the public place passed an order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, prohibiting the wearing of Gandhi caps within the limits of the Guntur Municipality and within a radius of 5 miles thereof. This order has since been set aside by the High Court. So far as the Government are aware, no other order affecting the wearing of khaddar caps or dress has been passed by any Magistrate.

19th November 1930]

Irrigation

North Bank Canal Scheme in Trichinopoly district.

43 Q.—Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that Government had provided one lakh of rupees for the carrying out of the works in the North Bank Canal scheme (Trichinopoly district) this year and sanctioned a special division for this purpose;

(b) whether the said special division has since been abolished and, if so, why; and

(c) whether any arrangements have been made to further up the work during this year?

A.—(a) Yes; but the special division was sanctioned for the *investigation* of this and other schemes, not for execution.

(b) Yes, as the investigation for which the division was sanctioned has been completed.

(c) The estimates are under the consideration of Government and they hope to issue orders shortly.

High level channel in Trichinopoly district.

44 Q.—Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) in what stage the construction of the bed regulator and the high level channel, Trichinopoly district, is; and

(b) if the estimates are ready for the scheme, whether the Government propose to put the work on hand and, if so, when?

A.—(a) & (b) The construction estimates of the scheme are under the consideration of the Government; the revenue estimates are awaited from the Board of Revenue; on receipt of them, the Government will examine the whole scheme.

Loans

Rate of interest on loans to cultivators.

45 Q.—Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that loans to cultivators under the Agriculturists' (Improvement) Loans Act will bear interest at $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum from the 1st April 1931; and

(b) what are the circumstances which have necessitated the increase in the rate of interest?

A.—(a) Loans granted on and after the 1st April 1931 under the Agriculturists' Loans Act and the Land Improvement Loans Act will bear interest at $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum.

(b) The items of expenditure and loss incurred by the Government in connexion with the grant and recovery of loans have been stated in detail in paragraph 2 of G.O No. 422, Finance, dated 1st June 1929, which has been made available to the Press. It has been shown there that the rate of interest

[19th November 1930

charged on advances to cultivators should generally be $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent above the Government's borrowing rate. With effect from the 1st April 1920, the rate of interest charged on advances to cultivators was fixed at $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent per annum with reference to the Government's borrowing rate for 1928–29, viz., 5 per cent.

Although it was announced in the Government Order above referred to that the reduced rate of interest of $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent on advances to cultivators would be in force only so long as the rate of interest on advances from the Provincial Loans Fund was 5 per cent, and although the latter rate was increased to $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent with effect from 1929–30, the Government decided, as a very special concession, to continue to charge the reduced rate of $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent on advances to cultivators during the year 1st April 1930 to 31st March 1931. At the same time, however, they directed that it should be widely made known that this special concession applied only to advances made in 1930–31 and that it was most probable that the rate would have to be raised with effect from the 1st April 1931.

The Government of India having now decided that the standard rate of interest to be charged by the Provincial Loans Fund in respect of advances made to Provincial Governments in 1930–31 should be $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent per annum, the Government have directed that the rate of interest charged on advances to be given to cultivators from 1st April 1931 should be fixed at $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum.

Minor Irrigation

Repairs to supply channel of Melakaruppur.

46 *Q.*—Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether in 1917, the Collector of North Arcot or the Executive Engineer, Vellore, directed the ryots of Melakaruppur village in Tiruvannamalai taluk to deposit a sum of Rs. 600 towards the repairs of or the construction of a supply channel to their village tank;

(*b*) whether the deposit was made by the ryots accordingly, and if so,

(*c*) whether the deposit bears any interest and if so, what;

(*d*) whether the contemplated repairs have been executed and, if not, why not;

(*e*) who are responsible for the delay, if any, and what notice the Government propose to take of their action; and

(*f*) whether the Government will be pleased to issue instructions to carry them out as soon as possible?

A.—The Government have not the information, but have called for a report.